

REMARKS

The Examiner requested that Applicants resubmit the IDS Form 1449. In response, Applicants have resubmitted the IDS Form 1449 herewith.

The Examiner objected to claims 8, 16, 26, 47, 54, and 58 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have so rewritten claims 8, 16, 47, and 54 in independent form so as to be allowable. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 17, 18, 32-34, and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Li et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-3, 12-13, 35, 44-45, and 50-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li in view of Voltz.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 7, 10, 15, 19, 23-25, 28-31, 36, 43, 46, 49, 52, 53, 55-57, and 60-70 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li.

The Examiner rejected claims 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li in view of Chan et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li in view of Beaman et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 27, 48, and 57 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

09/975,213

19

allegedly being unpatentable over Li in view of Kresge et al.

The Examiner did not provide any argument supporting the rejection of claims 9 and 59. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner either indicate that claims 9 and 59 are allowable or else provide arguments supporting the rejection of claims 9 and 59.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(c) and §103(a) rejections.

35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 17, 18, 32-34, and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Li et al.

Since claim 42 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 42 is moot.

Applicants respectfully contend that Li does not anticipate claim 1, because Li does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Li does not teach "wherein the at least two end contacts at the first end of the button are raised so as to extend beyond the dielectric core in a first direction parallel to an axis of the button, wherein the at least two end contacts at the second end of the button are raised so as to extend beyond the dielectric core in a second direction parallel to the axis of the button, and wherein the second direction is opposite the first direction".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Li does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-15, and 17-41 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-15, and 17-41 and 6 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 7, 10, 15, 19, 23-25, 28-31, 36, 43, 46, 49, 52, 53, 55-57, and 60-70 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li.

Since claim 70 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 70 is moot.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 43 is not unpatentable over Li, because Li does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 43. For example, Li does not teach or suggest "wherein the at least two end contacts at the first end of the button are raised so as to extend beyond the dielectric core in a first direction parallel to an axis of the button, wherein the at least two end contacts at the second end of the button are raised so as to extend beyond the dielectric core in a second direction parallel to the axis of the button, and wherein the second direction is opposite the first direction".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 43 is not unpatentable over Li, and that claim 43 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 44-46, 48-50, 52-53, and 55-69 depend from claim 43, Applicants contend that claims 44-46, 48-50, 52-53, and 55-69 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Since claims 5, 7, 10, 15, 19, 23-25, 28-31, and 36 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have argued *supra* to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants maintain that claims 5, 7, 10, 15, 19, 23-25, 28-31, and 36 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 2-3, 12-13, 35, 44-45, and 50-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li in view of Voltz. The Examiner rejected claims 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li in view of Chan et al. The

Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li in view of Beaman et al. The Examiner rejected claims 27, 48, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Li in view of Kresge et al.

Since claims 13 and 51 has been canceled, the rejection of claims 13 and 51 is moot.

Since claims 2-3, 12, 35, 20, 22, 21, and 27 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have argued *supra* to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants maintain that claims 2-3, 12, 35, 20, 22, 21, and 27 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Since claims 44-45, 50, 48, and 57 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have argued *supra* to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants maintain that claims 44-45, 50, 48, and 57 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The dependent claims have additional features supporting patentability over the cited references as demonstrated by, *inter alia*, the following three example.

As a first example, relating to claims 20 and 22, of why the dependent claims have additional features supporting patentability over the cited references, Applicants respectfully contend that Li in view of Chan does not teach or suggest "wherein the end contacts at the first end of the button each have a non-planar surface" (claim 20) or "wherein the end contacts at the first end of the button each have a sharp edge" (claim 22). The Examiner argues: "Chan discloses contacts including non-planar, sharp edged ends (120). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to construct the Li contact end to include non-planar sharp edged features as taught in Chan. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to increase the reliability of the final connection by providing aggressive mechanical piercing of

surface oxides and contaminates (Chan col. 5, lines 55-65)". In response, Applicants maintain that the preceding argument by the Examiner is not persuasive, because there is no teaching or suggestion in Li of a problem relating to surface oxides or contaminants on pads contacted by Li's conductive button.

As a second example, relating to claim 21, of why the dependent claims have additional features supporting patentability over the cited references, Applicants respectfully contend that Li in view of Beaman does not teach or suggest "wherein the end contacts at the first end of the button each have a surface concavity toward the conductive button". The Examiner argues: "Beaman discloses contacts including a surface concavity 16. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to construct the Li contact end to a surface concavity as taught in Beaman. The suggestion for doing so would have been to provide a good wiping surface as taught in Beaman (col. 3, lines 59-65)". In response, Applicants maintain that the preceding argument by the Examiner is not persuasive, because Li's conductive button does not perform a wiping action.

As a third example, relating to claim 24, of why the dependent claims have additional features supporting patentability over the cited references, Applicants respectfully contend that Li does not teach or suggest "wherein the second dielectric material and the first dielectric material each include a same dielectric material". The Examiner argues that "the materials of the core and jacket, the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended purpose would have been obvious. Sinclair & Carroll Col. V. Interchemical Corp., 65 USPQ 297 (1945); In re Leshin, 227 F.2d 197 (CCPA 1960). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to select a suitable materials (such as polytetrafluoroethylene or expanded polytetrafluoroethylene)

for the core and jacket, including same or different materials for the core and jacket.” In response, Applicants maintain that the preceding argument by the Examiner is not persuasive, because including the same dielectric material in the dielectric core and dielectric jacket is a limitation that is unrelated to the Examiner’s argument that “the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended purpose would have been obvious”. One could select from a variety of dielectric materials for inclusion in the dielectric core and dielectric jacket without requiring that the dielectric core and dielectric jacket include the same dielectric material.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 02/13/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schneiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

ATTY DOCKET NO.
END920010021US1

SERIAL NO.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION
(Use several sheets if necessary)

Brian S. Beaman et al.

FILING

GROUP

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	6,080,936	6/2000	Yamasaki et al.			
	5,540,594	7/1996	Collins et al.			
	4,090,768	5/1978	Tregoning			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION	
						YES	NO

OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)

EXAMINER

DATE CONSIDERED

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.